

EDP

JPRS: 3142

4 April 1960

MAIN FILE

LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES
AND COORDINATION OF THE WORK OF THE ACADEMY AND CHAIRS
OF PEDAGOGY OF PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTES, USSR

/Translation/

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Distributed by:

OFFICE OF TECHNICAL SERVICES
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
(Price: \$1.25)

THIS QUALITY INSPECTED 2

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

20000104 070

REF ID: A66111

• 001 001 001

FOREWORD

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

ATTENTION: INFORMATION

1. 001 001 001

2. 001 001 001
3. 001 001 001
4. 001 001 001
5. 001 001 001

6. 001 001 001

7. 001 001 001
8. 001 001 001
9. 001 001 001
10. 001 001 001

LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES
AND COORDINATION OF THE WORK OF THE ACADEMY AND CHAIRS
OF PEDAGOGY OF PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTES, USSR

Following is a translation of an article by I. A. Kairov
in Sovetskaya Pedagogika (Soviet Pedagogy), No. 2, February
1960, pages 16-44./

(Amendment of, and Supplement to, a report given at the All-Union
Conference of Heads of Chairs of Pedagogy of Pedagogical Institutes,
Moscow, 15 December 1959.)

The irregular 21st Party Congress set up as one of the chief
tasks during the period of the expanded building of communism, the
creation of a material and technical base for communism, the further
strengthening of the economic and defensive might of the USSR, and,
simultaneously, fuller satisfaction of the growing material and
spiritual needs of the people.

In the new historical stage of development of Soviet society,
the role of ideological work and of the communist education of the
masses increases immeasurably. Raising the communist consciousness
of the Soviet people has now become one of the decisive conditions
for the further increase in labor productivity, for the creation of
an abundance of material and spiritual benefits, and the conversion
of labor into the first need of life.

"The higher the consciousness of the millions in the masses,"
N. S. Khrushchev points out, "the more successfully our plans for the
building of communism will be carried out. That is why the question
of the communist education of the workers, particularly the coming
generation, now assumes particularly great significance."

Reorganization of the system of public education on the basis
of the Theses of the CC, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR, and
adoption of the Law on the Schools summon us to raise the entire
matter of the communist education of the younger generation up to a
new, higher level, to the level of the tasks facing us in the period
of the expanded building of communism.

The generation which is now entering our schools will live and work under communism. The schools must, right now, educate the man of a communist tomorrow.

It would be a mistake to think that this sublime task can be resolved within the framework of the old forms and old methods of training and education. The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR pointed out that "the guiding principle for the study of the fundamentals of science in school, and for determining the content, organization, and methods of instruction, should be a close tie between training and life, between training and production, and between training and the practice of the building of communism."

The decision on the means for the reorganization of the Soviet school, as given in the Theses of the CC, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR, and the Law on the Schools, is an example of the creative development of Marxist-Leninist teachings on the training and education of the coming generation under conditions of the expanded building of communism.

Great responsibility has been placed upon the pedagogical sciences for the successful reorganization of the schools. "The duty of the pedagogical sciences," the Theses emphasize, "is to take up the leading role in reorganizing the system of public education. To justify the faith of the Communist Party and of the Soviet people, to head the reorganization of the schools, to place the entire practice of communist education on a really scientific basis, is a matter of honor for workers in the pedagogical sciences. In order to fulfill these tasks, they should boldly decide the vitally important questions of the theory and practice connected with the training and education of children and youth, help the school do away with backward views, and remove all barriers barring the reorganization of their work on the basis of new principles.

The system of pedagogical opinions, principles, and regulations on standards, as expressed in contemporary textbooks on pedagogy, in courses on teaching methods, and in pedagogic literature, were formulated in a period when the school decided chiefly tasks of an intellectual education. A far wider circle of tasks has now been placed before Soviet pedagogy, expanding its boundaries significantly.

I. Basic Scientific Problems of Pedagogy In the Forthcoming Seven Years

In order to determine correctly the specific scientific problems which must be resolved in the near future, it is necessary, although in the most general way, to show what has been done by the Academy and chairs of pedagogy towards eliminating the backwardness of the pedagogical sciences. It must be said that, in the resolution of this task, we had at our disposal not just the one year which has elapsed since the publication of the Theses on the Schools of the CC, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR, but at least the 5 years which have elapsed following the famous conference of 1954 on the development of the pedagogical sciences, at which the question of doing away with its backwardness in the practice of communist education was raised very seriously. This full-scale conference at the Academy heard my report, presented upon instructions of its Presidium, on "The Condition and Tasks of Soviet Pedagogical Sciences," which, even at that time, was subjected to sharp criticism in the Soviet press. Voices were also raised over the critical condition of Soviet pedagogy. The conference admitted that what it was doing, basically, was dealing with individual small problems and that, by dint of the extreme narrowness and empiricism of the research done on those problems, it could not exercise serious influence either on the development of pedagogical sciences itself, or on school practices. The conference correctly criticized our educators for the fact that their work suffered from descriptiveness, did not provide a real, scientific basis for educational content, and failed to disclose a scientific basis for the formulation of curriculums and programs. Participants in the conference noted unanimously that educational theory was our weakest link.

The basic reason behind the backwardness of pedagogical sciences is the weak methodological armament of many of our scientific cadres, and the insufficiency of their ability to apply Marxist-Leninist theory to the resolution of pedagogical problems. Noted among the other reasons for the backwardness of pedagogy have been such factors as the unworkability and, sometimes, the primitiveness of research methods, literary-journalistic methods of writing up papers, poor introduction into practice of the results of pedagogic experiments, and the absence of complex research on the more important problems of the training and education of children.

The conference's resolutions formulated the basic problems of pedagogy and the methods for working them out. The concept of general and polytechnical education was explored anew, and the tremendous national economic and pedagogic significance of linking training and productive labor was emphasized. But the question of the correlation of general and polytechnical education with vocational training was

not then correctly decided. The report and speeches made at the conference left behind them the erroneous idea of the impossibility of combining general and polytechnical education with vocational training in a general educational polytechnical school.

The conference brought a certain degree of life back into the work of the Academy and chairs of pedagogy of pedagogical institutes. However, this appreciable break in their scientific activity was noticed only after the 20th Party Congress. N. S. Khrushchev's report and the speeches of a number of delegates to the congress rightfully criticized the directors of public education and outstanding figures in the pedagogical sciences for the fact that they spoke a great deal about the benefit of polytechnization but did very little towards its realization. There was placed before the pedagogical sciences the task of working out the methods and forms for schoolchildren to join in on productive labor, and to insure raising the level of general and polytechnical education and the educational work of schools.

In his report to the 20th Party Congress, N. S. Khrushchev said: "In order to strengthen the tie between school and life, it is necessary not only to introduce the teaching of new subjects in the schools which will provide the basis for knowledge of technical and production problems, but to get the pupils to join in on work at enterprises, on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and in school shops, on a regular basis." The Congress issued instructions on the creation of a new type of training-educational institution -- the boarding school.

The center of attention of the Academy and chairs of pedagogy, following the 20th Party Congress, was the working out of problems connected with maintenance of general and polytechnical education on the basis of the unification of training and productive labor. This does not mean, however, that all other questions were pushed aside. No indeed; both the institutes of the Academy and the chairs of pedagogy carried on research on a wide circle of problems dealing with instruction and educational theory. But the chief spot in research work was then taken up by such new questions as the system of public education, the content of general and polytechnical education, the relation between general and polytechnical education and vocational training, improvement of methods and organizational forms of training, and the methods and forms for getting pupils to join in on productive labor in industry and agriculture.

A new page in the development of Soviet pedagogical sciences and schools was opened following publication in the press of the notes of N. S. Khrushchev and of the Theses of the Central Committee, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR on the Schools. In expanding Lenin's theses on the communist education of children and youth, these party

documents indicated the method for strengthening the ties of school with life, and for the further development of the public education system in the nation. Together with this, they created extremely favorable conditions for the development of Soviet pedagogy and for the elimination of the dogmatism which had for so long acted as a brake upon its development and which had interfered with the resolution of vitally important problems. A creative searching and broad experimentation began in various areas of the nation. It was thus that remarkable forms of linking schools with life were born in Stavropol'skiy Kray, Ryazanskaya Oblast, in Siberia, and in the Urals. We became witnesses to, and participants in, a broad public and pedagogical movement, aimed at freeing the schools and pedagogy from triteness, routine, and verbalism, and at bringing them closer to the practice of the building of communism.

Following publication of the Theses, a considerable amount of work was done by both the Academy and by chairs of pedagogy of pedagogical institutes. I have in mind, foremost, all of the experimental work on the problem of linking training and productive labor carried on at the base and experimental schools of the Academy and of chairs of pedagogy of many pedagogical institutes, particularly the pedagogical institutes in Ryazan', Stalingrad, Krasnoyarsk, Leningrad (the Pedagogical Institute imeni Gertsen), Stavropol', Krasnodar, Novosibirsk, and a number of others.

Studied together with this was the experience of leading schools, which had successfully arrived at a tie between education and productive labor, in particular, the experience of schools in Stavropol'skiy Kray and Ryazanskaya Oblast.

The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences took active part in the development of the basic documents which set up the work of the schools on a new basis. I have in mind the regulations on schools of all types, curriculums and programs, educational work programs for schools, and letters on teaching methods for specified subjects.

It is impossible, within the limits of this report, to provide a detailed review of the results and status of scientific research on individual branches of the pedagogical sciences. Further on, I shall make certain remarks on the main problems in discussing our long-range plans for scientific research work. Right now, I would like to pose several questions for which we should provide answers.

How have pedagogical science workers grasped and to what degree have they understood the entire extent of the idea of reorganizing the Soviet school?

This question, I think, we can answer with full definitiveness: pedagogical science workers wholly share and warmly support the reorganization of the schools which has been carried out, and look upon it as the sole correct path for the further improvement of the training and education of the coming generation and for bringing it up to a higher level. The misunderstanding, doubt, and wavering of certain workers which occurred during the period of the development of proposals for school reorganization, have been basically overcome. I say basically and not fully because there are still certain aspects of school reorganization which face a serious ideological struggle. Among scientific workers, as well as among the practical workers in schools and public education departments, one still encounters comrades who sincerely support the over-all plan and the basic ideas of the school reorganization, but who think as before on certain essential questions. I have in mind, above all, the attitude of certain workers towards schools for working and rural youth.

The school law calls for two basic paths for the development of secondary education in the nation (I am not naming the third path — the technicums, of which we are not now speaking): the first path, which, may I remind you, was called the basic path in the Theses of the Central Committee, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR, involves the evening, shift, and correspondence general educational schools for working youth; the second path involves the secondary school with productive training. The proportionate share of each of these paths to secondary education can be seen from the following figures: in 1959, 45,000 boys and girls received certificates that they had completed secondary schools; of these, 32,000 were graduates of 10- and 11-year secondary schools, while 13,000 were graduates of evening, shift, and correspondence schools. In 1965, 72,000 persons will receive complete secondary education certificates; among these, 32,000 will be graduates of 11-year schools, while 40,000 — three times more than in 1959 — will be graduates of evening, shift, and correspondence schools. These figures show graphically the scale being attained in providing a secondary education for youth without taking them from their jobs.

Meanwhile, we still frequently encountered the outmoded view which looks upon schools for working youth as auxiliary schools, which they have already ceased to be. This attests to the fact that the reorganization of the minds of the scientific workers themselves cannot be considered as having been completed.

There is yet another important index to the profundity of recognition of the new tasks confronting the pedagogical sciences, and that is the participation of the scientific worker in carrying out the new school law. Here I am speaking of the tie between research and the practical work of the school, of introducing their results into the

practice of training and education, of raising the level of work of the base and experimental schools. I must add that there still exists a sufficiently large group of scientific workers who are not participating in the reorganization, either in their own scientific work or in their direct work in the schools. To us, in full measure, applies the demand made upon every scientific worker by the 21st Party Congress: to determine the position in the line which he intends to fill in order, through his own labor, to take an active part in the fulfillment and over-fulfillment of the 7-Year Plan.

* * *

What are the basic pedagogical problems which the research work of the Academy and of the chairs of pedagogy must center upon in the near future? It goes without saying that in a short report it is impossible to describe the entire circle of pedagogical, psychological, and methodological problems which we should work on. There is no need here to stop and discuss the 7-year research plan of the Academy. Inasmuch as that plan has been published, it must be assumed that the participants in this conference are familiar with it.

I will pause to discuss only certain divisions of the pedagogical sciences, and shall not touch upon special pedagogy, the history of pedagogy, and pedagogic psychology at all. It is more expedient in this report to limit myself to raising scientific problems in the field of general pedagogy, in instruction, and the theory of education. Inasmuch as even in those divisions of the pedagogical sciences I do not intend to deal with all questions, I shall pause upon only the main and more important problems, the study of which will facilitate the successful realization of school reorganization.

In the field of general pedagogy, or, in other words, in the field of the theoretical fundamentals of pedagogy, I shall call your attention to three problems only, which can be formulated thusly:

1. The Building of Communism and the School.
2. Education and Development and Their Correlation.
3. The Problem of All-Round Development Under Conditions of the Expanded Building of a Communist Society.

First of all, it must be noted that even now there is a serious lag in the working out of theoretical problems. Within the Academy, theoretical work on the fundamentals of pedagogy has been conducted, upon until now, only in connection with the preparation of textbooks on pedagogy. Work in this same vein was being done by the chairs of

pedagogy of the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute imeni Gertsen, by comrades Ganelin, Golant, Kazanskiy, Petukhov, and others; at the Moscow Institute imeni Lenin, by Professor Ogorodnikov; at the Moscow Oblast Institute, by Professor Shimbirev; at the Moscow City Institute imeni Potemkin, by Professor Shabalov and a number of other workers. But it is clear that chapters of textbooks or courses of lectures could not replace monographic research into the more important theoretical problems on the fundamentals of Soviet pedagogy.

Nor have the doctoral dissertations defended over the past 5 years remedied this situation. These dissertations were devoted either to the topic of the history of pedagogy (the dissertations of comrades Korolev, Radzhabov, Shamakhov, and others), or to the question of special teaching methods (M. I. Mel'nikov, Kiryushkin, Fedorova, Rykov, and others). Only two dissertations were written on general pedagogical subjects, those of Comrade Shabalov, on "Polytechnical Training in the Soviet School," and Comrade Danilov, on "The Training Process in the Soviet School." These two dissertations are, in themselves, a positive fact, but they cannot fill the great gap which exists in the field of Soviet pedagogical theory. Responsibility for this lies, of course, above all on the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. Permit me therefore to pause on the question of pedagogic dissertations and to discuss the subject in greater detail.

The situation regarding the preparation, defense, and, particularly, the approval of doctoral and candidate dissertations on the pedagogic sciences, must be acknowledged as unsatisfactory. There are very few doctoral dissertations. In the 25 years between 1934 and 1959, only 79 such dissertations on all branches of the pedagogical sciences were defended in the USSR. The principle shortcoming of candidate dissertations lies in the absolutely unsatisfactory, narrow, and nonapplicable nature of the topics on which they were written. I could cite the titles of a number of dissertations, titles which would bring on a smile, but I shall not do this. For it is not so much a matter of title, but the narrowness and one-sidedness of the topic which deprives the researcher of the possibility of scientific generalization or of drawing conclusions, i.e., does not move science forward, but, at best, can serve as material for articles, brochures, or popular books. On the other hand, subjects are sometimes chosen on which material might be gathered and put together more easily and quickly than in a dissertation.

The quality of the work is sometimes low. The experience of schools is presented in the form of material happened upon by chance, and is taken not from practice, but from literary sources. In the majority of instances, such material bears the character of illustration of well-known truths. True pedagogical experiment is rarely

presented. The low scientific level of many dissertations leads to their being rejected often by the Higher Certification Commission (VAK). Thus, over the past three years, 16 out of 24 doctoral dissertations have been approved. Four hundred and fifty-one candidate dissertations have been submitted over the three years. Candidate of sciences diplomas have been issued to 289 persons; 26 persons have been turned down. The remainder have been held for review, some of them for several years. Bearing the responsibility for this are not only the persons who write the dissertations, but their directors and advisors, opponents, and the collectives who take part in the approval of dissertations. This question should be studied in detail and the level of dissertations raised.

All of this bears witness to the lag in Soviet pedagogic theory. This great shortcoming was also indicated in the Theses on the Schools of the Central Committee, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR, which demanded a renewing of attention to the working out of the theoretical questions of pedagogy. This is fully understandable. It is impossible now to resolve the problems of instruction, the theory and methodology of educational work, and of school science, without serious theoretical research on the fundamentals of Soviet pedagogy. The works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin provide, in their general theoretical plan, the solution for the more important problems of pedagogy. Set down in them are the fundamentals of the theory of the all-round development of the coming generation, the theory of polytechnical education, and the theory of intellectual and moral education. But now life peremptorily demands a further theoretical development of the Marxist theory of training and education, which takes into consideration our nation's transition into a period of expanded communist construction and the great socialist reformation which has taken place in the socialist nations.

The direction and basic content of theoretical research has been set forth in the Theses of the Central Committee, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR on the Reorganization of the Schools. It is necessary to emphasize that these Theses enrich the Marxist theory of all-round development: in pointing out the specific paths for the amalgamation of education with productive labor under conditions of the new historical stage in the development of Soviet society; and, in essence, resolving anew the question of the mutual relations and ties of general, polytechnical, and vocational education, they thus already provide the prototype for the schools of a communist society.

Let us examine certain theoretical problems on the fundamentals of Soviet pedagogy.

It is necessary, first of all, to carry out a number of important research projects on the problem of "The Building of Communism and the School." In its broader aspects, the problem might be formulated thusly:

"Society and the School." Essentially, it is a pedagogic, philosophic, and economic problem. It must be resolved in conjunction with philosophers and economists.

Marxist sociology has always manifested and continues to manifest the specific dependency of the school upon society, and the role it plays in social development. Even as far back as the period of the formation of Soviet pedagogy as a Marxist science, there was firmly implanted in it the concept of the historic and class character of education in the class society. But this characterization of it began to be relegated chiefly to material on the history of pedagogy, and primarily to the earlier periods of the history of man -- to Athens, Sparta, and the Middle Ages. The characterization of bourgeois education ends, as a rule, in the first half of the 19th Century. This concept played right into the hands of bourgeois ideologists. They are prepared to recognize the evils of the old capitalism, but they seek to show from all of this that modern capitalism essentially is not capitalism but something entirely different, and have even begun to think up new names for it. Misusing figures on the growth in the number of schools and the number of pupils in them, bourgeois scholars spread fairy tales about the equal opportunity to receive an education in modern capitalist society, about the existence of schools available to all, and about the organization of education on the basis of statistics on the so-called "measurement of mental endowment," which serves only as a cover for the propertied classes' monopoly on education. The exposure of these and other false bourgeois theories is one of the real problems of Soviet pedagogy.

Disclosure of the historical and class character of education has not included a whole variety of the mutual ties and bonds between school and society. The school, for example, fulfills such an important function of social life, as facilitating the continuity of changing generations. It transmits to the younger generation the experience amassed by preceeding generations, experience accumulated in science, engineering, and in the cultural achievements of society; it plays an outstanding role in the development of the chief productive forces of society -- workers, technicians, engineers, etc. All of these ties and bonds are worthy of most careful research not only in the historical pedagogical but in the theoretical plan also.

The second large group of questions underlying the problem of "Society and the School," is the study of the role of the school in the struggle for the victory of socialism. In the program of our party, the school is looked upon as a weapon for the eradication of the division of society into classes, as a weapon for the communist reformation of society. Soviet schools and the schools of other socialist nations have accumulated a tremendous amount of experience

in the resolution of this task. The time is long past for a comprehensive research study of general and specific problems in the educational systems of the various countries of the socialist camp. Under conditions of the expansion and the strengthening of the world socialist system, under conditions of the broadening and deepening of the cooperation of socialist nations in economics, culture, and education, this problem acquires particularly important significance. There was a time when the socialist nations assimilated the experience of the Soviet Union in the field of public education. But this period has already been left far behind. While continuing to take into consideration and to utilize the pedagogical experience of the Soviet Union as applied to political and economic conditions within their nations, all the countries of the socialist camp are making their own valuable contribution to Marxist-Leninist pedagogical science. The theoretical generalization of this multi-faceted experience will, without doubt, promote the more successful resolution of pedagogical problems in all nations of the socialist camp.

It would be incorrect for our nation also to relegate the study of the role of the school in the consolidation and victory of socialism to research on the history of pedagogy. The struggle for the victory of socialism is also a struggle for communism, but only for its first phase. The experience of educating the coming generation in the spirit of socialist ideology, the struggle for the mastery of science fundamentals and the application of knowledge to labor for the good of society, the role of the school in the development of the culture of the peoples of the USSR, national in form and socialist in content, as well as our rich experience in the thorough development of the physical and moral capabilities of our children and youth in the period of the struggle for the victory of socialism -- all of this should enter into the basic fund of contemporary Marxist-Leninist pedagogy. Our experience is unmasking bourgeois theories on the unchangeable private ownership nature of man, on the capability of only chosen peoples for historical development, and on the everlastingness of the division of peoples, on the one hand, into a privileged minority ordained by nature to think and to lead, and to engage in science, literature, and art, and, on the other hand, into a grey mass of the majority, whose destiny is subordination and hard labor.

Emergence of our nation into the period of the expanded building of communism has demanded intensification of the attention of the entire Soviet society to the matter of educating the coming generation. Successful resolution of the schools' new tasks requires the working out of a whole complex of questions tied in with its reorganization, and linked to the requirements of the development of the national economy, science, and engineering. Therefore, research on the problem of "Scientific and Technical Progress and the School" brooks no delay.

In working out these problems, there comes to the fore the question of how and in what form the school should react to the latest achievements of science and engineering, and how the contents and methods of instruction should change in connection with scientific and technical progress. The experience of recent years has demonstrated that the development of science and engineering depends, to a large degree, upon the school. Everyone now recognizes that a large share in the outstanding achievements of Soviet science and engineering belongs to the work done by our schools, by our Soviet teachers. It is not accidentally that the Americans, and not only the Americans, are manifesting tremendous interest in the organization of school affairs in the USSR in recent times. Pedagogy must respond to the question of how the school forms and develops the scientific and technical interests and capabilities of its pupils.

In doing research on problems connected with "The Building of Communism and the School," it is necessary that particular attention be devoted to the question of preparing the pupil for participation in the various forms of Communist social self-government. In other words, special theoretical research should be instituted on the subject of "The Forms of Communist Social Self-Government and the School."

The next important theoretical problem is, as I have already indicated, the problem of "The Education and Development of the Coming Generation." Following the well-known 1936 decree of the Central Committee of the Party on "Pedagogical Distortions in the System of the People's Commissariats of Education," certain of our workers in the pedagogical sciences, having failed to examine this decree as they properly should have, adopted an incorrect attitude. Contrary to common sense, they began simply to deny the need and the orthodoxy of any research whatsoever into the differences between children, to be used for pedagogical purposes. Dogmatically citing out of context individual phrases and even words taken from the text of the decree, they attacked as "pedological" Ushakov's Precise Dictionary of the Russian Language defines "pedology" as "a false science based on anti-Marxist hypotheses and profoundly reactionary 'laws' on the fatalistic conditionality of the fate of children to biological and social factors and the influence of heredity and unchangeable environment" / all methods involving research into the age and individual differences of school children which went beyond the bounds of simple observation and the common methods of checking their knowledge.

Despite the fact that over 20 years have elapsed since that decree, this incorrect and one-sided attitude has yet to be subjected to criticism, and continues to interfere seriously with the development of true Marxist teachings on children. Meanwhile, there is no doubt that, without studying the personality of the youngster, it is

impossible for a teacher to carry on his practical educational activity on a scientifically sound basis. The most important thing here is the careful compilation of materials giving the specific developmental history of the child's individuality, the history of the development of children's collectives, and the history of the interrelations formed within those collectives. But, having cut out research on the age and individual differences of children, pedagogy became essentially "childless." This not only deprives pedagogy of the possibility of utilizing scientific psychological data on its students, but even gives birth to an incorrect approach to such an important problem as that of the training and education of the youngster.

An incorrect approach to this problem was the result not only of an absolutely inadequate study of the age differences of children, but also of our failure in recent times to work out a theory of mental and psychological development. Education is not separate from the youngster's process of development as a whole. Therefore, limiting pedagogy's field of vision to the school, class, and lesson results in the teacher's being helpless when it comes to the youngster's personality.

We must state, however, that there has been a certain amount of research done in recent years on the problem of education and development. Special research on the aspect of "Education and Development," has been carried on since 1957 by a group of scientific associates of the Institute of the Theory and History of Pedagogy, under the direction of L. V. Zankov, and at the Leningrad Scientific Research Institute of Pedagogy, under the direction of P. G. Anan'yev. In 1956, the journal Sovetskaya Pedagogika (Soviet Pedagogy) published an article by G. S. Kostyuk discussing the problem of education and development. Published during 1957 were several articles by psychologists and educators. The material discussed helped indicate the path for working out this important theoretical problem. A concluding article on the discussion correctly pointed out that without disclosure of the natural ties between the influence of the teacher and the psychological development of children, pedagogic theory cannot respond to the question on the methods and means for the thorough development of the physical and mental capabilities of the pupils. The working out of this problem can raise the level of the school's training and educational work.

In need of some profound research, based on contemporary material, is the problem of the comprehensive development of the younger generation under conditions of the expanded building of a communist society. There is no necessity to point out that, now, when there is being placed before us the task of preparing youth for labor and for life in a communist society, we should approach this problem of comprehensive development differently than we have done in the distant

past. The transition to communism signifies the abolishment of existing differences between the city and the village, and between physical and mental labor. The man of a communist society will harmoniously combine physical and mental work in his activities. From the Marxist point of view, only such people can be considered comprehensively developed.

But life does not consist of labor alone: it consists also of judicious rest. The more productive labor becomes, the more the time for rest will increase. In a communist society, rest will include many-sided activity in the field of art, sports, etc. Even now amateur artistic activity has attained such scope within our nation and has reached so high a level, that it often withstands competition with professional masters of art. It would be a great mistake for the school not to note this phenomena and to limit the education and training of the younger generation solely to preparation for labor. Preparation for labor, undoubtedly, is the main task. But it is not the sole task. Comprehensive development, based upon an amalgamation of education with productive labor, should include preparation for life in the broadest sense of that word, including ideological-political, physical, aesthetic education, etc.

Theoretical research, experimental work, and the study of experience of leading schools must be developed on all the component parts of the problem of comprehensive development. All this research should be aimed at studying the process of the comprehensive development of pupils in two basic aspects: under conditions of the unification of education with productive labor, and under conditions of combining general, polytechnical, and vocational education in the school.

It must be noted that, in the process of satisfying the pressing requirements of the school in this field, a certain amount of work has already been done. Here I am speaking of determining the place of polytechnical and vocational training in the secondary school curriculum, and of drawing up of a program of general technical and special subjects. In the training of secondary school students in various industrial and agricultural professions alone, the Institute of Teaching Methods of the Academy has worked out some 75 programs. Several aids for labor and polytechnical training have been created to aid the teacher. I have in mind the aid created by Rozanov, Zavitayev, and Tseytlin on lessons in manual labor for the primary school, Shchukin's work on "School training and Experimental Garden Plots," the aid created by Dubov, Markin, Peshkov, and Fadeyev on labor training in the fifth to seventh grades (please do not confuse this with the album of instructional cards prepared by the latter two authors, which clearly was not up to their standards), the aid on machine studies, electrical engineering, and the fundamentals of agriculture of M. A. Zhidelev, B. M. Smetanin, A. A. Shibanov, and others. All of these aids have played a positive role.

Somewhat worse is the situation regarding the theoretical development of the problem of polytechnical and vocational training. In recent years the following books have been added to earlier published works on the subject: Shibanov's Politekhnicheskoye obucheniye v sel'skoy shkole (Polytechnical Training in the Rural School); S. G. Shapovalenko's Politekhnicheskoye obucheniye v sredney shkole na sovremennom etape (The Present Stage of Polytechnical Training in the Secondary School); the collective work of associates of the Institute of Teaching Methods, under the editorship of S. G. Shapovalenko, Soyedineniye obucheniya s proizvoditel'ny'm trudom (Combining Education and Productive Labor), based on the experience of 50 schools; and a number of handbooks, reflecting the experience of schools of Stavropol'skiy Kray and of the Ryazanskaya, Stalingradskaya, Kalininskaya, Gor'kovskaya, Sverdlovskaya, and other oblasts. All of these works bear witness to the accumulation in schools of valuable experience gained in combining education with productive labor, and therein lies their important significance. Any further research projects should devote greater attention to the theoretical and pedagogical development of new questions in polytechnical and vocational training.

Together with a large number of general pedagogical, organizational, and material-technical questions connected with the wide-scale linking of students to productive labor, the question of the interdependence of labor and education has become particularly acute.

In the 1920's, efforts were made to subordinate education to labor. It was looked upon then as a pivot, around which were grouped fragmentary data from the various branches of science necessary for the practical resolution of the labor task. As is known, these notorious complexes and intertwinings led to a disruption of the system for studying science fundamentals, and had, as their sad consequence, a lowering of the level of general educational knowledge. Proven groundless also were the efforts made at the beginning of the 1950's to resolve this problem by subordinating one or another separate topics of the programs in botany, zoology, physics, etc., to an aspect of labor.

The system of knowledge was not disrupted by this, but labor thereby acquired an episodic, disrupted character, and was converted only into a simple illustration of the subject under study.

The school and pedagogical sciences have again encountered difficulties at the present time in establishing ties between education and productive labor. Naturally, neither one nor the other resolution of the problem should now be revived. But, at the same time, we should not build up education and labor as two independent and unconnected processes, although such proposals are sometimes made. For

the purpose of argument here let us cite the well-known words of V. I. Lenin to the effect that "neither training and education without productive labor, nor productive labor with parallel training and education, could be placed on the height demanded by the modern level of engineering and the state of scientific knowledge." It is clear from the entire context of this statement, however, that Lenin had in mind here not the educational, but the social-political and economic, aspect of the problem. It is precisely about this aspect that Lenin's criticism of Yuzhakov's project was centered.

A. S. Makarenko is also quoted to the effect that no ties whatsoever between education and labor are needed. But, in ridiculing artificial ties only, Makarenko well understood that modern labor is impossible without being tied in with theoretical knowledge and with an ideological-political education.

Ties between education and productive labor are necessary both for raising the level of labor, as well as for overcoming abstract knowledge. The law on the schools has established that a close tie between education and labor should be the leading principle of training and education. All educational subjects should be tied in with productive labor, but this tie will vary, depending upon their specific character. Special subjects are directly tied in with productive labor. Knowledge of these subjects is utilized as guides in directing work. A knowledge of general machine studies, electrical engineerings, in general agriculture and animal husbandry, is fundamental to the study of special subjects. They are tied in with productive labor both directly and indirectly, through the special subjects.

The ties between mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology with labor can also be dual -- both direct and indirect. When, in the process of his work, the student makes measurements and calculations, his knowledge of mathematics and physics are directly included in the labor process and serve it. But, in many instances, general educational knowledge is tied in with labor indirectly, through the general technical and special subjects, for which they serve as the theoretical basis.

In order to make easier for the teacher the practical attainment of close ties between education and productive labor, we must work out specifically the content, organizational form, and teaching examples for each subject. The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and many chairs of the pedagogical institutes are now working on this at the present time. The "front" of this research should be expanded in every way possible.

A second, very important question -- that of combining general, polytechnical, and vocational training -- is closely connected with tying education in with productive labor. Right now, those three are component parts of secondary education.

General education provides basic knowledge about nature, human society and thought, and the corresponding skills and habits necessary for every person regardless of his future profession. Mastery of general educational knowledge serves as the basis for a scientific world outlook and facilitates the development of cognitive forces and capabilities. At the same time, it is the foundation for a polytechnical and vocational training.

Polytechnical training provides knowledge on the chief branches and scientific principles of modern production, arms us with the skill of handling the most diffuse weapons of labor, develops creative technical capabilities, and inculcates a love and respect for physical labor. In providing a broad, general technical labor preparation, it creates the conditions for a free choice of profession. But to master any sort of specific profession, it is not enough to have a general and polytechnical training: for this purpose, a vocational training is also needed. Vocational training provides special knowledge and habits necessary to the worker of a given profession and on the scale required for proper productive labor.

Vocational training and the improvement of production qualifications in schools of the second stage of secondary education does not in any measure cancel out, but, on the contrary, calls for polytechnical education as a necessary link in the general system of education. V. I. Lenin warned of the inadmissibility of mixing the concept of "polytechnical" and "monotechnical" (that is, vocational) education. Not being identical with polytechnical education, vocational training should be carried out on a polytechnical base and in connection with it.

Thus, between general, polytechnical, and vocational education a direct tie actually exists, which tie becomes ever closer and more integral with the growth of production and the development of technical equipment. Only a school which simultaneously provides a general, polytechnical, and vocational education can train people who are well-rounded, who know science fundamentals well and who, at the same time, have a mastery of a profession and are capable of systematic labor. But the school can resolve this task only if the proper lines of intercommunication between general, polytechnical, and vocational education are established. This places before the pedagogic sciences a series of extremely important problems.

Achievements in the natural sciences are introduced into production, as a rule, not directly, but through the system of the technical sciences. Therefore, one of our most important problems is the establishment of correct mutual ties between subjects in the natural sciences cycle and general technical subjects. The complexity of this problem lies in the fact that the logic and system of that general educational knowledge which pedagogy has come to call the basic sciences, and the logic and system of the technical sciences differ substantially. What is necessary is research into the scientific-technical and instructional basis of the content and methods of teaching the elements of engineering and production in the teaching of the fundamental sciences.

Following the introduction of general technical and special subjects, the study of production in the teaching of physics, chemistry, and other subjects continues to be an important component part of polytechnical education. Elucidation of the mutual ties between that portion of polytechnical education which is carried out through general technical subjects (machine studies, electrical engineering, draftsmanship), and through the special subjects of production training -- is a very pressing task for pedagogy.

Between general, polytechnical, and vocational education, in addition to the objective scientific ties mentioned above, there exists still another type of tie, promoting their influence upon the development of the students. Production training (theoretical and practical) and productive labor exercises such great influence over the development of students that it cannot but be reflected in the effectiveness of both general and polytechnical education. Technical thinking in all of its specificity is still very much a function of general development. However, there is almost no research in this field.

An important task of pedagogical science is also the creation of general and particular methods in the teaching of special subjects. It should not be thought that one may be guided by the theses of general didactics alone in developing such teaching methods. As far as vocational training is concerned, we should think through again a number of our basic theses on general didactics.

One of the most important of our instructional problems is developing the scientific fundamentals of the content of education. This was especially emphasized in the Theses of the Central Committee, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR on the Schools.

Relying upon the results of experimental work conducted in 1956-1958, and upon the experience of leading schools which have successfully unified education and productive labor, the Academy has now

worked out the drafts of curriculums and programs for the 8-year school and for the secondary school with production training. At the present time, in connection with the shift of schools to a new curriculum, an experimental check is being made of new subject content in the first to fifth and in the ninth grades. In the course of the check there will also be studied such questions as conformance of program content to the new tasks of the school, the ties between education and life, the ideological-educational basis for the study of the given subject, simplicity of training material, and pupil study load conditions. The Academy has already embarked upon the development of the scientific-pedagogical basis of educational content in the evening (shift) secondary general educational schools.

It is necessary to note, however, that in determining the content of secondary education, we are proceeding, in a number of instances, not along the path of their basic review in the light of new school tasks, but along the path of introducing certain changes in training programs which were laid down in the 1930's. A great deal of research work needs to be done in order for us to work out a truly scientific basis for educational content in all types of schools. Based upon the new tasks of the school, we should decide the following circle of questions on the content of school education: 1) changing it in keeping with the development of the economy, engineering, culture, and science in our nation; 2) changing it in connection with the tasks of communist education, which have been achieved at various school levels; 3) differences in the age development of students of lower, middle, and upper school grades, and the degree of their education and training; differences in training and education in schools for working and rural youth; 4) combining general and polytechnical training in the 8-year school; development of a curriculum and program for this type of school; combining general, polytechnical, and vocational education in various types of secondary schools; development of curriculums and programs for secondary schools with production training and evening (shift) general educational school; 5) influence of the principle of combining education and productive labor upon the content of education in the school; 6) mutual ties, unity of material and formal elements in educational content; 7) correlation between theory and practice at various school levels and in various subjects, and their reflection on educational content.

In addition to these questions, which provide a scientific basis for the correct resolution of problems connected with the content of school education as a whole, pedagogical science must work out also a number of specific questions on the compilation of curriculums, programs, and textbooks: 1) science and the training subject; 2) principles in the selection of material for the training subject; 3) training load for pupils of various ages; 4) a system of educational subjects; 5) mutual ties between educational subjects; 6) character of the disclosure of content in the school program; 7) scientific-pedagogical requirements for textbooks and other school books.

As you know, the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences has worked out a new system of instruction in history, which, following discussion, received the support of the Central Committee of the CPSU. The Central Committee's decree on the teaching of history in the schools raises that subject to a new level. Confronting us is the task of preparing a scientifically based resolution of questions dealing with the system of labor training and education, and the system of literary, physico-mathematical, and natural sciences-geographical training in the school.

A second, most important instructional problem posed in the Theses of the Central Committee, CPSU and the Council of Ministers USSR, is the problem of teaching methods. The task now consists of bringing the system of teaching methods into full conformity with the new requirements placed before the schools, and with new educational content.

It is well known that in school practice the oral method of training chiefly has been widely applied. Methods activating the cognitive activity of pupils (observation, experiment, laboratory work, practical training, etc.) have begun to be applied only in recent times and not in all schools. Films, radio, and television are still too little utilized in the educational process. Only limited application is made of various types of independent creative work on the part of pupils. That is why verbalism, and the formalism and dogmatism closely allied to it, in instruction have not been eliminated from the schools. Unification of education and productive labor, expansion of participation of pupils in socially useful labor will undoubtedly have a positive effect on changing teaching methods and on raising the initiative and activity of pupils.

Teaching methods are inescapably linked with the organization of the educational process in the school. It is evident that, at the present time, we should not limit ourselves solely to the classroom lesson form of training. Together with lessons in school and homework, more and more use is being made in school training of production practice, socially useful labor, production, regional, and other excursions, class and group elective subjects, tourist trips and expeditions, etc. Particularly great significance is being attached now to the Central Committee's instructions on the need to apply a variety of methods and organizational forms of work, based on the specific training and educational task, and taking into consideration the age level of pupils.

We must admit that, up until the present time, little attention was devoted to working out teaching methods. Over the course of many years there was not carried out even a single serious research effort into the theory of teaching methods. As a result, the discussion on teaching methods carried in the pages of Sovetskaya Pedagogika failed also.

Following the Central Committee's decree, "On Curriculums and Schedules in the Primary and Secondary School," of 25 August 1932, our educators occupied themselves chiefly with repeating and commenting on the decree's theses on teaching methods instead of being guided by this party document into creative research on, and generalization of, the methods used by leading teachers.

It was only in recent years, in connection with the tasks of preparing our pupils for life and for labor, that a certain animation was observed in the activity of our educators. In 1958 and 1959 articles on stepping up the educational activities of pupils were published in general pedagogical and methodological journals and in certain Uchenyye Zapiski (Learned Notes) issued by pedagogical institutes. Among them there should be singled out the articles on research into the problem of didactics published in the Uchenyye Zapiski of the Chair of Pedagogy of the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute imeni Gertsen. Interesting material on this subject is contained in a book by M. F. Morozov, a scientific associate at the Institute of Psychology, entitled Vospitaniye samostoyatel'nosti mysli shkol'nikov v uchebnoy rabote (Developing Independence of Thought in Schoolchildren in Teaching), and in R. G. Lemberg's work Metody obucheniya v shkole (Teaching Methods in the School).

I must add that, in recent years, the Sector on Didactics of the Institute of the Theory and History of Pedagogy has also started to work upon the problem of stepping up the independent work of schoolchildren. Taking part in this research are the chairs of pedagogy of a number of pedagogical institutes: the Moscow Institute imeni V. I. Lenin, the Leningrad Institute imeni Gertsen, the North Osetian, Yaroslavl', Khar'kov institutes, as well as the Leningrad, Rostov, Voronezh, and Karelian state universities.

In connection with changing school teaching methods in the direction of strengthening the independent activity and initiative of pupils, the need for the improvement of organizational forms of educational work has also arisen. Over recent years, the problem of raising the effectiveness of the lesson has come to the fore. But quite a few works have already been published on this subject. This is only the beginning: research upon the question of improving the class lesson must be continued.

Together with this, we must also study other forms for the organization of training: study circles, brigade and individual work, and particularly such new forms for the organization of pupils' activities as student production brigades, training-experimental plots, school construction brigades. In this respect, great interest has been aroused in a recently published handbook, Politekhnikeskoye obucheniye v

sredney shkole -- iz opyta raboty gorodskikh i sel'skikh shkol (Polytechnical Training in the Secondary School -- From the Experience of Urban and Rural Schools), as well as by materials from the Krasnodar session of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and the Novosibirsk Conference. The shortcoming of published material is that they describe individual instances, the experience of individual schools and teachers. It is time now to shift to a theoretical generalization of this experience, and to the creation of a major work on the theory of methods and organizational forms of training under the new work conditions of Soviet schools. From this point of view, the book Didaktika (Didactics) published in 1957 and written by M. A. Danikov and B. P. Yesipov, which summarized the leading experience of schools prior to the publication of the Law on the Schools, is already outdated: there are not reflected in it the place of new methods and organizational forms of teaching, born out of the practice of combining education and productive labor. The creation of a new, general work on didactics which will respond in full to the new tasks of the schools is one of our most pressing tasks.

In connection with the school reorganization, two questions of the teaching methods problem have become most pressing at the present time: 1) the role and character of the ties between theory and practice in teaching, and 2) correlation of the activities of the teacher and the activities of the students in the teaching process.

The direction in which the first of these problems is being worked out is, in turn, being determined by the requirement that the pupils master knowledge to the degree which would facilitate their ability to consciously apply it in practice, in the fulfillment of production assignments, and in other forms of socially useful labor. Together with this, it is necessary that, in the training process, practice be used to greater extent than it has been up until now, and that it serve as the initial point for students to acquire knowledge.

Development of the second question is evoked by the need to step up the independence and activity of students in the teaching process. It should be established what types and forms of independent work are more expedient to apply in various training tasks and with students of varying ages. This, in its turn, requires a review of the character of direction of the cognitive and practical training activity of the students on the part of the teacher. Confronting him is the task of doing everything in his power to improve their activity in all phases of the training process.

In connection with the fact that, in schools of the new type, there will be carried out a single process for the thorough development of students, based on the unification of education and productive

labor, didactics can no longer limit itself to the study of only one side of teaching -- the basic sciences. Now it must expand its boundaries and also take up the development of the content and methods of production training.

Particularly pressing is the problem of the content or subject matter taught, and the organization and methods of training used in school for working and rural youth. You know that, prior to the Law on Schools, these schools were not essentially different from regular 10-year schools. All the difference lay in the fact that training in them was conducted in the evening, or in keeping with their work shifts, while their weekly number of class hours was less than in the regular secondary school.

According to the Law on Schools, schools for working and rural youth have become one of the basic types of secondary school, in which working youth can receive a completed secondary education and raise their production qualifications. Obviously, we must not approach these schools as we did before, and to look upon them as a copy of an 11-year school with production training. If these schools are called upon to provide a complete secondary education, this does not at all mean that they must work in accordance with the curriculums, programs, and textbooks of regular schools. We must not ignore the fact that the students attending the evening, shift, and seasonal schools are young workers and collective farmers, who have had experience in production and in life and, in addition to the knowledge they acquired in the 8-year school, who possess a certain amount of knowledge which they acquired by themselves. What might be useful, evidently, is for us to consider our experience in developing curriculums and programs for the former workers' faculties. They too provided a secondary education, but never copied the curriculums, programs, and textbooks of schools of the secondary stage. Of course this does not mean that we should take the workers' faculties as our example. What I am saying is that we need to consider the experience of the past in order to determine the specific character of schools for working and rural youth more fully and comprehensively. Many of them are already trying to decide teaching and program problems independently: they are introducing corrections in programs, applying the lecture system of training in the upper classes, and are shifting to tests in a number of instances. All of this is providing the student with a certain amount of time in which he is free to carry out independent work.

It must be noted that our educators have not at all yet undertaken the study of questions connected with training and education in schools for working and rural youth. There is only a small amount of teaching aids and material on individual subjects available on this subject. Initiation of the working out of problems involving the

content of education, and the methods and organizational forms of training in schools of this type, is an urgent task for our educators and the resolution of which they should undertake without delay.

The education problems of evening schools also need a different resolution. Students in those schools usually include workers, testing its educational influence upon themselves. We cannot, of course, apply the usual means of education to these schools. The task of institutes of the Academy and of chairs of pedagogy is to dig down deep into the specific character of the educational work of schools for working and rural youth, and to develop their teaching methods.

A great shortcoming in research on didactics is the almost complete lack of work done on the problem of educational training. At the present time, when the ideological hardening of our youth and the development in them of an ability to live and to work in the communist manner is so necessary, it is extremely important to facilitate the serious working out of the problem of the bringing up (vospitaniye) of students in the educational process.

The study and generalization of the experience of the boarding schools should occupy an important place in our research work. This remarkable new type of school appeared thanks to the wise perspicacity of our party. Being accumulated in these schools is new, rich, and all-round experience in bringing up students; one might say that, here, pedagogic virgin soil is being upturned.

Study and generalization of the experience of the boarding schools was begun by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and by the chairs of pedagogy immediately after the creation of such schools. At the beginning, of course, these schools were provided with only, if one may express it that way, first aid. We should include in the plan for such aid, for example, the handbooks issued by the Academy on Vospitatel'naya rabota v shkolakh-internatakh (Educational Work in Boarding Schools), Trudovoye vospitaniye v shkole-internate (Labor Education in the Boarding School), Fizicheskoye vospitaniye v shkolakh-internatakh (Physical Education in Boarding Schools), and Organizatsiya rezhima dnya vospitanikov shkol-internata (Organization of Schedules For Students of Boarding Schools).

A series of handbooks on the boarding schools have been published by chairs of pedagogy, and by institutes for the advanced training of teachers. But now, such aid should not be limited. In the practice of the operation of such schools many critical questions arise, to which the pedagogical sciences must provide an answer. But neither the Academy's workers nor the chairs of pedagogy are going on further with their

description of the experience of individual boarding schools. There is no argument about it -- the experience must be studied, but we should now shift from describing this experience to large scale generalization upon it, and to the working out of an integral system of training and educational work in these institutions of a new type.

We cannot limit ourselves to the resolution of teaching methods problems alone. Theoretical problems, and sharp ones, confront us also. To these problems belong that of the social education of the entire younger generation, questions of correlation between social education and family education, and the combination of collective and individual, direct and parallel activity by Soviet pedagogy.

To facilitate the comprehensive development of the personality of every one of its pupils, and of their cognitive forces and capabilities -- this is the main purpose of the boarding school. From this stems the problem of combining training with labor, and the necessity to study the specific character of training and education in the boarding schools.

One of these characteristics is the fact that, here, children are under the constant pedagogical influence of their teachers and tutors. In this connection, the task of organizing the entire life and activity of the pupils must be tackled anew. Here the problem of homework, the question of the correlation of training independent of, and under the immediate direction of the instructor, etc., must be resolved differently.

The boarding schools, which have been called upon to provide the example for the organization of training and educational work, the training of youth for life and for labor, should become the focus for outstanding pedagogical experience, and the standard for the mass schools. In order to really create a system of operation for this institution, the problem of the pedagogy of the boarding school should be studied en toto.

Life itself has now placed before the pedagogical sciences the task of the organization of schools of the extended-day type. Right now there are only a few such schools. But this is the long-range, prospective form of training and education of children and youth. The extended-day school is the transitory stage to the boarding schools. No one can doubt that, as material conditions are created, the usual general educational school will shift to the status of a boarding school. It is important therefore to do research on all transitory forms and, above all, on the specific character of the training and education work of extended-day type schools.

In light of the task of school reorganization, the working out of problems connected with the theory and method of communist education is assuming exceptionally important significance. Successful resolution of the new educational tasks of the schools depends, to a great deal, upon how practical school workers are armed with the knowledge of the basic natural laws of the process of shaping the personality of the builder of communism and the man of a communist society.

It is well known that N. K. Krupskaya, A. S. Makarenko, and S. T. Shatskiy have made an important contribution to the theory and method of communist education. Publication of their works will aid teachers in mastering the pedagogical inheritance of these outstanding Soviet teachers, and to apply them to their practical work. It would be a mistake, however, to limit ourselves to this. The task consists of developing and expanding the Marxist-Leninist theory of education while generalizing upon the leading experience of the best schools and teachers. The life and modern practice of the Soviet school, working in conditions which are entirely different from those of the 1930's, confronts us with a whole series of new theoretical and practical pedagogical problems, answers to which cannot be found in the works of Krupskaya or Makarenko. The new problems of communist education should be solved in conjunction with all achievements of Soviet pedagogy and, what is particularly important, in conjunction with the prospects for the development of our school in the period of the expanded building of a communist society.

Over recent years there is discernible a certain movement forward in the field of the theory and method of communist education. Worthy of mention among the theoretical works dealing with individual aspects of moral education is the work by V. A. Sukhomlinskiy, Vospitaniye kommunisticheskogo otnosheniya k trudu (Inculcation of a Communist Attitude Towards Work). A series of questions dealing with moral education in the Soviet school are posed and resolved in the work of N. I. Boldyrev, Vospitaniye kommunisticheskoy morali u shkol'nikov (Inculcation of Communist Morals in Schoolchildren). Important research in the field of moral education is being done by the Chair of Pedagogy of the Krasnoyarsk Pedagogical Institute. O. I. Ruta, the head of this chair, was able to unite the workers of a number of other chairs for joint research on this problem. The problem of discipline in the school is advanced somewhat by V. Ye. Gmurman's book, Distsiplina v shkole (Discipline in School).

All these research projects and many others, which I cannot pause to discuss here, demonstrate that the abstract-educational approach to questions of moral education is beginning to be overcome somewhat. Both in the theory and in the practice of moral education the labor

principle is becoming ever more and more affirmed. Of great significance in the working out of this trend is the program of educational work created by the Institute of the Theory and History of Pedagogy of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and tested by way of experiment in many schools of the nation.

Despite all this, in objectively evaluating all that has been done over recent years in the field of educational theory, we must admit that the level on which it now finds itself cannot be considered satisfactory. Having achieved a certain degree of success, educational theory has still not resolved many of its most important problems. A serious shortcoming is the fact that it, as a rule, only looks out after practical education, often lags behind it, and never looks forward to tomorrow.

The development of a system and method for the labor education of schoolchildren at various age levels is acquiring great importance. The initial step in labor training and education is the work done by children in taking care of their own needs. In the process of caring for their own needs, they become accustomed to the systematic, sometimes uninteresting to them, humdrum work which they encounter in life. Already in many schools at the present time students themselves are fulfilling all necessary work involved in taking care of their own needs. We must study and generalize on this good experience, develop scientifically based recommendations and a system for this new type of work. Detailed research is also required by the problem of the psychological and practical preparation of students for labor.

In keeping with the process of the development of socialist labor into communist labor, i.e., into labor for the benefit of all without consideration of reward, the question arises of raising the proportionate share of moral stimulants in labor activity. A scientifically founded resolution of the question of the formation of moral work stimulants will promote the further development of the theory of labor education.

And in the field of the theory of labor education, the very same experience of leading schools, which have successfully united education and productive labor, can serve as an inexhaustible source for working out actual problems.

A second very important problem in the theory of education is that of the formation of the basic traits of communist morals in children and youth. Leaders in the pedagogical sciences have been called upon to disclose and to place a scientific foundation under the new moral qualities needed by the builders of communism, as well as more effective methods for the inculcation of these qualities into

the younger generation. We would include such qualities here as a fervent love of their Soviet Motherland, a striving for peace and friendship among peoples, a high consciousness of their social duties, a striving to work for the benefit of mankind, collectivism, fraternal mutual relations, and a tactful attitude towards people, discipline, and voluntary observance of the standards and rules of a socialist way of life.

Under the amalgamation of education and productive labor, the task of the formation of a communist world outlook in students should be resolved in a new fashion. It must be admitted, however, that this problem is being given most insufficient attention in research being done by the Academy and chairs of pedagogy. Nor are there being worked out questions dealing with atheistic education — the most important component of all the school's work on the formation of the fundamentals of a scientific and material world outlook. This situation has become absolutely intolerable.

The process of amending ideology is a complex and a long one. It cannot lead to the complete abolishment of vestiges of the past in the minds of people without expedient ideological educational work. In order to help the school fully do away with vestiges of the past which have penetrated into the minds and the behavior of the coming generation, there must be included in our research plans for the near future a review of the more effective forms and methods of atheistic education, both in class and in non-class work. These questions should be decided in psychological research also.

Worthy of serious attention now are questions of developing in students the habits and customs of cultured behavior, and the compilation of a code of moral education. Our weakened attention to these questions has led to the regeneration, in a number of instances, of Philistine rules of "good form" and to the alienation of outward from inward behavior.

Special significance are being acquired these days by the problems involved in the social-political education of school children. The methods for the formation within them of a communist world outlook, the development of political and labor activity, of initiative and independence — all these questions are demanding great attention on the part of leaders in the pedagogical sciences.

"It is already clear," N. S. Khrushchev said at the 21st Party Congress, "that many functions now being fulfilled by government organs, should be shifted gradually to public organizations." That is why, today, on the closest approaches to communism, that youth must be readied for active participation in organs of communist self-government.

An important problem in the theory of education is the development of the theoretical fundamentals of Pioneer and Komsomol work. The educational role of these communist organizations of children and youth is now particularly increasing. The task of the leaders of pedagogical sciences is to work out the basic problems of content and teaching methods in this work at the various stages, and to create teaching aids for teachers and Pioneer leaders. It is time to shift from handbooks made up of articles and instructional materials to the creation of basic works on the problem of Pioneer and Komsomol work in the schools.

Our times must find a new resolution also of the problem of the teacher's attitude towards his pupil. The teacher should now step forth not only as the mentor, tutor, and friend of children, not only as the director of their educational activity, but as the organizer of their socially useful labor as well. He is now called upon to create new attitudes not only in class, but outside its walls as well -- in production, and in workers' and kolkhoz collectives. These new phenomena in the life of our schools should be profoundly studied, analyzed, and generalized upon.

Finally, the problem of education methods needs a new method of resolution. It is necessary, above all, to do away completely with the one-sided enthusiasm for methods of oral influence, and to eradicate all cliches and banality in the education process. Getting students to participate wholeheartedly in socially useful labor will create a more solid base for enlivening educational methods, and for fuller utilization of the school's educative possibilities. Improvement of teaching methods will require the solving of such questions as the correlation of persuasion and training in the education process, and organization of the collective activity of students and of socialist competitions. An interesting discussion on the latter was carried by the journal Sovetskaya Pedagogika, a discussion which no doubt aided in the working out of this problem more fully.

Research into problems of physical and aesthetic education should occupy an important spot in the work of the Academy.

The tasks of physical education cannot simply be lumped with the meeting of standards for the "Ready for Labor and Defense" and "Ready for Sanitary Defense" badges. All of this is the result of education, while its content determines the tasks of educating a physically healthy and strong person, full of life and capable of physical work and the defense of his Motherland, a person both manly and brave. It is necessary to emphasize, in this regard, that physical education should not be limited to physical culture lessons alone. This is only one, albeit an important, side of the question. What is

most important right now is to work out a system, content, and method of physical education both within and outside of school, as well as organization and methods for sports work.

Problems of aesthetic education are now acquiring particular significance. Its role is increasing in conjunction with the necessity for improving the general culture and development of the new man. A new way must be found to solve the task of inculcating an aesthetic judgement and artistic taste in youth. Special attention should be devoted to the study of the aesthetics of labor, and methods for developing organic ties between artistic and moral education. I doubt whether we can expand the artistic education of children in school to include music, singing, and drawing lessons. This is an important and necessary aspect, but the center of weight ought now be shifted to the problems of extracurricular work and, above all, to the development of children's self-activity in all aspects of the arts. Our chief efforts should be aimed at working out a system for the artistic education of the students.

In the resolution of instructional and educational problems, pedagogy should make wide use of the data on age qualifications and that furnished by pedagogical psychology; in a number of problems, pedagogy should carry out complex research with the participation of psychologists. Many questions in educational theory and practice cannot be solved successfully without data on age qualification psychology, and knowledge of the laws of development of the schoolchild's individuality, consideration of the specific psychological characteristics of every age group and of the individual psychological differences between children. On the other hand, age qualification psychology can develop successfully only if it is not limited to narrow laboratory research, but engages in the study of the child in the natural surroundings of its life and activities, in the specific conditions of its education and training. Thus, there is a two-sided link between age qualification psychology and pedagogy. Each of them proceeds from data furnished by the other science, is guided by it, and serves as a guide in its turn.

Even closer and indissoluble is the tie between pedagogy and pedagogic psychology. Certain people are, in general, inclined to look upon pedagogical psychology as a part of pedagogy, and not psychology. Without yielding here to a detailed examination of this question, it must be considered, nevertheless, that there is no longer any doubt that pedagogical psychology, in its study of the concrete forms of the activity and behavior of children and youth in educational and training work, lies at the junction of two sciences -- psychology and pedagogy -- and is the borderline scientific discipline between them. It studies the natural laws involved in the

acquiring of knowledge and habits in school, of the individual differences involved in their mastery, the ease of understanding of the training material, the psychological effectiveness of various teaching methods, the psychological requirements of textbooks, training equipment, and school work schedules. A most important subject of study also is the process of the formation of the individuality of schoolchildren, their general regularity and individual differences, the influence upon schoolchildren of various educative measures, and the psychological fundamentals of the self-education of students.

Though being closely tied one to the other, pedagogy and pedagogical psychology nevertheless do not coincide in their subjects of study: pedagogy studies the laws of development of the training and education process, while relying upon its knowledge of the peculiarities of the child's psychological development; pedagogical psychology studies the specific aspects of the activities of the child under conditions of purposeful and planned training and education work with him.

As for pedagogical research, it must be noted that over recent years there have been certain achievements made in working out important problems of child and pedagogical psychology. To the list of the more developed problems in recent times belongs the problem of the mastery of knowledge by children of various school ages. Through research conducted in the Institute of Psychology and at the various chairs, it was demonstrated that the process of mastery of knowledge is very closely connected with the process of its application to solving training tasks in practice. Psychological research provides the possibility for uncovering more effective conditions for the utilization of knowledge in practice. This has particularly great significance in the light of the task of school reorganization. The study of both regularity of the mastery of knowledge, as well as the laws governing the formation of motives behind learning, makes it possible for us to approach the substantive discovery of the didactical principles of the consciousness of education. Psychological research aids us in converting many proven pedagogical methods and examples into methods and examples used in the independent work of school children.

Side by side with revealing the laws of development of the mental activities of children, there is being conducted a study of their individual psychological differences, as manifested in the process of their education and training. This work is based on research into the physiological fundamentals of individual psychological differences -- the characteristics of the child's higher nervous activities. For the study of individual psychological differences there are now being worked out methods both for use in laboratory experiments as well as for observation and natural experiment, methods which provide the possibility for revealing typical differences of children as manifested in the

peculiarities of their behavior, formation of personality traits, and mastery of knowledge. The most favorable conditions for this work are being created in the boarding school. Developed, as a result of this research, have been the principles for compilation of psychological-pedagogical characteristics and for their specific program.

Study of individual differences provides us with the opportunity to mark out the path for an individual approach to children under training and education conditions. Particular attention has been devoted to the study of children who are failing in their work and who are undisciplined. Works have been published in which proposals have been made for preventing unproficiency and lack of discipline and which disclose the means of struggling against these phenomena.

In shifting to the tasks of Soviet psychology, it should be noted that it is psychology's duty to take a most active part in the school reorganization, and in the scientific development of questions connected with the psychological and practical preparation of children and youth for labor.

A communist attitude towards labor and the corresponding moral qualities of personality do not arise and become fixed by themselves, without special, pedagogically directed leadership. And in order to make this leadership function more successfully, a knowledge of the psychological peculiarities of the students' work is required. It is necessary to know their attitude towards labor, to disclose their work interests and motives, to study the flow of the very process of the formation of a conscious and responsible attitude towards labor, the stages through which this attitude passes and what facilitates it and hinders it, and how attitudes towards labor change depending upon content and conditions. Psychological research of these questions can provide real aid for the pedagogical direction of labor.

One of the big problems connected with the educative role of productive labor, is research on differences in personality formation caused by differences in the various methods for including students in productive labor. In this connection, serious attention should be devoted to the problem of personality formation in young workers in communist labor brigades, inasmuch as here completely new and special conditions for the all-round development of young men and women working in those brigades are being created.

To this same group of timely problems attaches the question of the development in schoolchildren of collectivism under various organizational forms of labor. It is particularly important to study this question, especially as applied to the age at which the student should be included in productive collectives which include adults.

The formation of a communist attitude towards labor, and the moral side of personality which goes along with it, is the central link in the psychological preparation of students for labor. Another necessary part of their preparation for life is their practical preparation for labor, plus equipping them with labor habits and skills. It is precisely this aspect of labor activity, tied in with the development of creative and organizational capabilities, which ought become the object of special attention, inasmuch as it is important from the point of view of educational tasks and polytechnical training in the school. An essential premise for working out all problems of labor education is a psychological study of professions. This work will have very great significance for the professional orientation of students.

An expanded circle of psychological problems arises in connection with the task of changing the content of education and methods of instruction used in schools for the teaching of general-educational and polytechnical cycle subjects. Psychology should take an active part in searching out new and more effective means for combining education with labor. The correct realization of this principle presupposes a close, mutual tie between the assimilation of knowledge and labor activity. Research should disclose how students apply the knowledge acquired by them in practice, how new knowledge is acquired in the process of work, and under what conditions labor becomes the source for arousing the need for knowledge.

Psychological problems connected with the improvement of teaching methods in schools, as related to the task of making them more active, comprise a very important research field. Psychological research should be aimed at uncovering the "hidden reserves" prevalent in the training process and hitherto unutilized. It is necessary to teach the student to work independently, and to "extract" knowledge by himself to a certain degree. A wide-scale study must be begun into the means for the more expedient formation in schoolchildren of independent mental activity, based on the ability to extract and to apply knowledge. All these problems should be decided in consideration with age and individual differences, and on the basis of the application of diverse methods of research.

It is necessary that special attention be devoted to the development of methods of studying individuality for practical purposes: for the scientifically based selection of children for special schools, for vocational consultation work, and to aid the teacher in determining the means for an individual approach to the student. Creation of such methods is important also for shedding light on what type of general and polytechnical outlook is acquired by students in the process of their school training, the measure of their preparation for participation in socially useful labor, what their cognitive interests are, etc. This data might be used as criteria for judging the effectiveness of the training and education process.

Along with this new research, there should be a broad expansion of work done on checking and introducing previously attained results into school practice. The success of this work can be assured only if there is cooperation between scientific workers and teachers.

As we have seen, the development of the pedagogical sciences is linked with research into a tremendous mass of problems and questions. The task lies in selecting the most vitally important and urgent among them, arising out of the general tasks of school reform. Together with this, we should keep in mind that they can be resolved only through the inclusion of a large number of the highly competent collectives of scientific workers of the Academy, chairs of pedagogy of pedagogical institutes, methods specialists of institutes for the advanced training of teachers and of pedagogical study rooms, school teachers and public education figures (primarily, inspectors) in this work.

In research to be done by the Academy and by chairs of pedagogy, an important place should be devoted to a study of the most important differences in the specific character of the work of the national (non-Russian) schools. In recent years, the Institute of National Schools of the Academy has worked out standard programs for Russian language and literature, and set scientific methods requirements for textbooks on those subjects. In connection with these demands, a whole series of experimental Russian language textbooks for the national school was created.

In the forthcoming 7 years, the Academy and chairs of pedagogy, in relying upon experimental work done previously, must improve the content of education in the native and Russian languages and literature in schools of autonomous republics and oblasts. Having determined the scope and content of the educational material on these subjects in the light of the new tasks of the school, we must provide aid to the autonomous republics and oblasts in the creation of the necessary textbooks. At the same time, research should be undertaken on the problems of methods for teaching these subjects in the national school.

Problems connected with the development of the pedagogical sciences, the training of national scientific and pedagogical cadres, and the advance of pedagogical culture, are very important and very pressing. For a review of these problems, it behooves us to call a special conference in 1960, and to prepare for it carefully.

II. Methods and Organization of Scientific Research in Pedagogy

The success of research into any field of cognition, to a considerable degree, depends on how thoroughly tested, scientifically based, and tried the research methods are. Every pedagogical problem can be solved successfully if one proceeds from a scientifically based initial position and uses correctly and precisely those research methods which, above all others, befit the character of the subject under discussion.

In recent years, both in the field of didactics as well as in the field of educational theory, quite a few efforts have been made to place research upon a solid scientific base, and to find effective methods for it. A series of works have already made their appearance, based on this serious approach to the resolution of urgent problems of the Soviet schools and Soviet pedagogy. I have already named certain of these works, and shall not repeat their names here. Unfortunately, these positive examples have not yet become typical. In the overwhelming majority of works, particularly in dissertations, extremely imperfect research methods continue to be employed in the study of pedagogical phenomena. Study of the experience of schools and of teachers bears a summary, perfunctorily descriptive character, without profound analysis of the facts involved. From this stems the absence of true theoretical generalization. It is only natural that research of this kind is not having, nor can it have, any noticeable and positive influence upon school practice.

There are still quite a few workers in the pedagogical sciences who think it fully adequate if, along with a description, they provide a certain explanation of the pedagogical phenomena under study. It might be useful, in connection with this, to remind such workers how Ivan Petrovich Pavlov evaluated the role of explanation in science. "I, of course, have nothing against explanation in science," he said. "Of course, facts could not exist without understanding, without explaining them, but explanation is not the aim of science but a means of science."

In order to eliminate these serious shortcomings, pedagogical research methods should be basically amended. From the usual observation and simple description of pedagogical phenomena, we must shift sharply to detailed analysis of and generalization upon, such phenomena. For this it is necessary to expand experimental work on a wide scale, and to check its results in the practice of the school and the teacher. It goes without saying that the scientific resolution of problems also requires the formation of a so-called working hypothesis and "trials" of those projected research methods which will guarantee successful results.

Methods for the study of and generalization upon the work experience of leading schools, and attainment of the principles of the amalgamation of education with productive labor, have particularly important significance right now. In the interest of the successful reorganization of our schools, study of this experience should be assigned particular singleness of purpose. This end can be attained if research into this experience is carried out on such topics as the connection between education and life in the teaching of the basic sciences; awakening pupils' activity and independent activity in the process of their mastering scientific knowledge; the pedagogical conditions most favorable for uniting education with productive labor; and the formation of the basis for a scientific-materialistic world outlook and communist morals in students, and many others.

In many research projects over the past few years, the share of experimental work and pedagogical experiments has increased. In many instances, however, this experimental work bears an extremely undifferentiated character. This results from failure to create special didactical material for experimental work, failure to spell out precisely the methods to be used in teaching or instruction, and because forms and methods for the calculation and development of experimental work results are very poorly delineated. Under these conditions, results with like success may receive the most diverse interpretation.

In a number of instances, there has been noted a tendency to identify experimental work with pedagogical experiments. This is absolutely incorrect. There is much in common between them, of course. In contrast to experimental work, pedagogical experiment is characterized by more differentiated methods, provides more precise quantitative and qualitative data both on the character of the process as well as of its results, and, finally, uncovers the achievements and shortcomings of the subject under study by contrasting it with the control subject, as selected from mass practice.

At the present time, particular significance is being attached to experiments which shed light upon the tie between the activities of the teacher-tutor and the process by which pupils assimilate knowledge, habits, and skills. This requires the conducting of complex pedagogical experiments participated in by, for example, educators, teaching methods specialists, and psychologists. A considerable amount of work in this direction has been done in the Laboratory of Experimental Didactics of the Institute of the Theory and History of Pedagogy, under the direction of L. V. Zankov, active member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.

But no matter how well developed the research methods, they cannot yield positive results if, in practice, the researcher has not mastered them, and if he is not able to precisely plan and carry out the process of training and education on a high level.

In order to achieve a high level of pedagogical research, it is necessary not only to work out its methods, but to work out a detailed methodology on the fulfillment of the various research operations. This includes pedagogical observation of, and interviews with pupils, pedagogical analysis of phenomena, methods of setting up hypotheses, the methods to be used in their gradual checking out and clarification, the setting up of experimental work and pedagogical experiments, etc. Only the combination of objective methods of scientific research and the subjective preparedness of the researcher for them will guarantee the success of scientific work.

Closely tied in with the methods of pedagogical research are the forms of their organization. Here, primarily, arises the question of cooperation between scientific workers and teachers who are participating in working out one and the same theme. The question is easy to solve when the research task permits instruction (or education) and research into it to be concentrated into the hands of one man. This is the long-range form for the organization of scientific work, which will become predominant in all fields of science following elimination of the existing differences between mental and physical labor.

For the time being, however, under existing conditions, this is not possible. Usually, fulfillment of practical work in school takes up all of a person's time, and he does not have sufficient time for scientific activity. Many scientific workers, through the force of ingrained habit, often do not manifest the slightest interest in work in school, even in the introduction of the results of their research into practice. We can no longer, of course, put up with people such as these. Everything possible must be done to expand and strengthen cooperation between teachers and their scientific associates. To this end, the copyright privileges of every participant in research should be maintained fully.

One of the forms for cooperation between scientific workers and teachers is the pedagogical laboratories which have been organized at schools. The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences is now in the process of organizing the network of such labs. Such laboratories create opportunities for long and regular joint work between workers in the pedagogical sciences and teachers on urgent pedagogical problems.

Wide dissemination is being given to correspondence ties between scientific institutes and chairs of pedagogy, and with individual teachers or entire pedagogical collectives of schools, who are carrying out experimental work in close contact with, and even in conjunction with the institute's or the chair's plan. For example, the Institute of Teaching Methods of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences has such ties, on the problem of the unification of education and productive labor, not only with the pedagogical collectives of schools, but also with institutes for the advanced training of teachers. The same sort of ties were established by the Institute of the Theory and History of Pedagogy for the experimental verification of educational work programs with all RSFSR institutes for the advanced training of teachers, and with many school pedagogical collectives. A great number of the chairs of pedagogy have wide correspondence ties, particularly with teachers who have graduated from those institutes and who are now conducting experimental work. Everything possible must be done to foster such forms of creative cooperation.

Being organized in republics, krays, and oblasts now are departments of the USSR scientific-pedagogical society. The society has set as its task the unification of scientific forces and practical school workers for joint creative work over education and training problems. The experience of the cooperation of scientific workers and teachers and, in particular, the conducting of "Pedagogical Readings" lends itself very well to the further development of this cooperation.

A second problem in the organization of scientific work is the coordination of research on the pedagogical sciences. Scientific and experimental work devoted to questions of training and education in the USSR is being conducted by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, with its 8 institutes. Within a short time, an Institute of Pre-School Education is to be organized under the Academy, while the Institute of Teaching Methods will be divided into an Institute for 8-Year Schools and an Institute of Schools of the Second Stage of Secondary Education. Thus, the Academy will have 10 institutes in its system. In addition, there are scientific research institutes of pedagogy in each union republic, while the Ukrainian and Georgian SSRs have additional institutes of psychology.

In the nation, there are over 250 chairs of pedagogy of pedagogical institutes and universities, about 150 institutes for the advanced training of teachers, and more than 2,500 city and rayon pedagogical study rooms. The number of teachers participating in scientific research, experimental and teaching method work may be gauged, for example, by the fact that 1,860 reports by teachers were made at recent republic "Pedagogical Readings." All of this attests to the tremendous scale of scientific and experimental work in the nation devoted to the problem of training and educating the coming generation.

However, the effect of all of this work is lowered a great deal, not only because of imperfect research methods, but as a consequence of the poor organization of this matter. Examples of the dissociation of scientific workers and of failure to coordinate plans for research can be cited no end -- they are known to all of us, and I shall not name them.

To eliminate this abnormal situation, the Presidium of the Academy has adopted a resolution on the creation of scientific councils (uchenykh sovetov) on the basic problems of training and education, and on the coordination of the work of scientific research institutions of pedagogy and chairs of pedagogy.

The necessity for such an organizational restructuring of scientific work I will demonstrate by using the example of one of the most urgent of training and education problems, that of the problem of unifying education with productive labor. A great deal of theoretical and experimental work on the various aspects of this problem and that of combining general, polytechnical, and vocational education is being carried on. Groups of such scientific workers, teaching method specialists, and teachers are headed by: B. F. Rayskiy, of the Stalingrad Institute; K. I. Vasil'yev, of the Voronezh Institute; D. D. Nazarov, of the Krasnodar Institute; Professor S. M. Shabalov, of the Moscow City Institute; Docents Krugovova and Kretova, of the Orel Institute; Docent M. M. Rozhkov, of the Penza Institute; Professor V. I. Selivanov, of the Ryazan' Institute; Professor N. I. Alpatov, of the Chelyabinsk Institute; Docents A. K. Perov and M. I. Moskvina, of the Sverdlovsk Institute; Docent I. T. Ariskin, of the Tula Institute; P. I. Borovitskiy, of the Leningrad Institute imeni Gertsen; and P. A. Stepanov, of the Kuybyshev Institute. Docent Yu. V. Sharov organized collective research which brought together into it workers of chairs of pedagogy and institutes for the advanced training of teachers in Novosibirsk, Kemerovo, and Tomsk oblasts, and Krasnoyarskiy Kray. Work on the subject of "The Psychological Preparation of Children of Younger School Ages For Labor" is being conducted by members of the chairs of the Irkutsk Institute, under the direction of Comrade Permyakova.

I have not named here the directors of all collectives engaged in the study of the problem of unifying education with productive labor, but only those, the results of whose work has reached us in one or another form. As you can see, you can count only 15 such collectives. If you were to join these to the scientific collectives of the Academy, and to the scientific research institutes of union republics, you would see that we possess a highly qualified council of specialists, capable of resolving pressing problems connected with school reorganization.

It is intended to create the same type of scientific councils on the problem of the content of education, on problems connected with training and education in the boarding schools, on moral, aesthetic, and physical education, and on the history of pedagogy. There may be created, in the future, councils on pre-school education, on the fundamentals of Soviet pedagogy, and on the problem of training and development, and others.

The basic task connected with the unification of scientific workers and teachers into scientific councils on the various problems comes down to the need for changing the existing, primitive organization of scientific work on pedagogy into more improved forms of organizations, in which the role of every worker belonging to it will be determined by his contribution to research on the given problem. These councils will not have any administrative functions whatsoever: they will not be able either to approve or decline plans or the results of completed scientific work. But their judgement and evaluation of research, expressing the point of view of qualified specialists working in the given field, naturally, will be highly authoritative and will provide immeasurable aid.

Scientific councils on the various problems of pedagogy should operate so as not to weaken, but rather strengthen existing ties between school workers and chairs, tie between chairs and scientific institutes, and between workers of the chairs of various institutes. All forms of ties between practical school workers and pedagogical science figures should be strengthened. For example, worthy of a positive evaluation is the experience of zonal associations of scientific workers engaged in the same or in associated problems. I have in mind the unification about the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute imeni Gertsen of scientific workers in the field of pedagogical education; the unification about the Krasnoyarsk Institute of scientific workers of pedagogical institutes, institutes for the advanced training of teachers, and pedagogical collectives of the schools of Siberia, jointly working on the problem of moral education; the unification of all forces about the Novosibirsk, Khabarovsk, Sverdlovsk, and other institutes. The Ministry of Education and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences should provide more energetic aid than it has done previously to such forms for the unification and coordination of scientific work.

For coordination of the scientific research of the union republics in the field of training and education, it is intended to create a committee on coordination under the Presidium of the Academy.

Complex and responsible are the tasks confronting Soviet pedagogical sciences. The problems connected with educating the new man, the man of a communist society, is an object of sharp ideological struggle between communist and bourgeois ideology. Experience in the communist education of the coming generation, both in our nation and in the socialist countries of Europe and Asia demonstrates irrefutably that the psychology of private ownership, individualism, and indifference to public affairs -- all these are not indigenous qualities of man, but virtues engendered by a capitalist society. Our experience in education is convincing evidence of the fact that, with changed social circumstances and with socialist social relations, other qualities of man's personality, such as a high consciousness of social duty, a striving to work for the good of society, voluntary observance of the norms and rules of the community of man, fraternal mutual aid, and an attitude of intolerance towards violators of social order can be developed. On the base of developing communist productive relations, the communist traits of Soviet man, traits born of a socialist society, will be successfully formed. It is due precisely to the fact that such a man actually does already exist that the task of forming the man of a communist society is becoming urgent.

This great aim is inspiring the entire army of Soviet teachers and pedagogical science workers onto creative labor. I believe that I am expressing the unanimous opinion of all those participating in this conference in saying that the workers of the pedagogical sciences recognize the full measure of their responsibility for the reorganization of the schools, that we are indebted to the party, to its Central Committee, and to Comrade Khrushchev for their clear, Leninist program for the development of public education in our nation. We shall apply all of our efforts and knowledge to put this program into practice with as much success as possible.

- END -